|                                   |      | EXHIBITS   |                |
|-----------------------------------|------|--|----------------|
|                                   |      | (contid)   |                |
| Doc. Def.<br>No. No.<br>1070 3696 |      | Description  Sworn Statement  Major-General F.S.G.  Piggott, Military  Attache to the British  Embassy, Tokyo, 1921- 1926 and 1936-1939                                | In<br>Evidence |
| 1069 3697                         | 7    | Affidavit of IINUMA,<br>Mamoru   | 36893          |
| 2910 369                          | 8    | Affidavit of TAKEBE,<br>Rokuzo   | 36893          |
| 2959 369                          | 9    | Affidavit of TAKEI,<br>Seitaro   | 36896          |
| 3200                              | 3700 | Outline of the Speech made<br>by the Chief of Staff,<br>Kwantung Army, at the<br>Conference of Formation<br>Commanders in December,<br>1941 - dated 5 December<br>1941 | 36902          |
| 3201                              | 3701 | Outline of the Speech made<br>by the Chief of Staff,<br>Kwantung Army, at the<br>Conference of Formation<br>Commanders in April 1941                                   | 36907          |

INDEX

Of

Wednesday, 7 January 1948 INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal
War Ministry Building
Tokyo, Japan The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, at 0930. Appearances: For the Tribunal, all Members sitting. For the Prosecution Section, same as before. For the Defense Section, same as before. (English to Japanese and Japanese to English interpretation was made by the Language Section, IMTFE.) 

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

MR. BLEWETT: If the Court please, yesterday the President announced that the Tribunal may have further questions of the witness.

THE PRESIDENT: We have a few, Mr. Blewett, and I shall put them immediately.

8

10

11

13

14

HIDEKI TOJO, an accused, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

12 BY TH

TOJO

BY THE PRESIDENT:

15

16

18

20

22

23 24

25

Q At page 95 of your affidavit you say there was a telegram from the British Ambassador in Tokyo addressed to the British Foreign Minister Eden dealing with the prospects of a settlement between the United States and Japan. You say that "We looked upon this as a typical observation entertained at that time by a third party . . " Did you know at that time of the telegram to Mr. Eden?

A I did not know the fact that the telegram at that time was sent to the Foreign Secretary Eden but I have written this testimony in my affidavit from what I heard from Foreign Minister TOYODA that he had informed Ambassador NOMURA to that effect.

тојо 36,818

Q We note that according to exhibit 2908 the telegram to Mr. Eden was in figure cipher. However, you do say that at the time the substance of the telegram was known to Japanese ministers.

A I have not stated in my affidavit that it was known to a circle of people. Perhaps there might be some mistake in the translation, I do not know. This much is a fact that the fact of this telegram was known by the Foreign Minister, that the Foreign Minister told me about it, and that the Foreign Minister informed NOMURA about it.

Q Well, that is all we want to know.

Now, in your affidavit in paragraph 130 you deny all responsibility for the behavior of the army in the field, and you stated that the final responsibility involved in those matters rested with the Chief of the General Staff. We have two observations on this on which we invite your answer:

The first: According to Article 1 of the Organization of the War Ministry the War Minister controls officers and civilians in the military service.

2. There have been introduced in evidence several instructions of the War Ministry concerning the behavior of the army in the field, among them the field section instructions, exhibit 3069, issued by

Q

you in January 1941, and directed to all army officers, soldiers and civilian employees of the army as to their behavior in the field.

Was it not the War Minister's duty to see these instructions were carried out?

A May I make a plain reply to that question?

According to the regulations governing the organization of the War Ministry the War Minister controls officers, soldiers and civilians attached to the army, that is, he supervises the status of the officers and men and civilians in the field. However, responsibility for any acts made by officers and men or civilian employees of the army after they have been organized and placed under the supervision and control of the high command falls under the responsibility of the high command, that is to say, the Chief of the General Staff.

Perhaps my reply has not been too clear so

I shall add a few more remarks. The Minister of War
is, while being a member of the government, is at the
same time a participant in the Imperial General Headquarters and in that status, that is, as a participant
in the Imperial General Headquarters the War Minister
has the duty of looking after matters of military,
that is army administration as well as military personnel in connection with operational matters. Hence,

тојо 36,820

the acts of such personnel do not fall under the responsibility of the government but under the responsibility of the high command.

That, generally, I think answers the question.

Q Could the War Minister order a court-martial in case he knew that laws of warfare were violated by officers or soldiers in the field?

A Order for any court-martial is issued by the Chief of the Army General Staff. However, the War Minister participates in any such matters in accordance with his status, that is to say, is responsible for the handling of military administration, that is, administration of army affairs and army personnel.

Q Did you ever discuss plans to prevent the destruction of oil fields in the Netherlands East Indies as referred to in exhibit 628?

A No, I have not.

8 the following appears: "If any of the important natural resources should be destroyed, all the persons connected with the raw material, ten government officials concerned, shall be severely punished as being the responsible persons."

Did you take part in the making of that decision?

Where was that order issued from?

3

5

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18 19

21 22

20

23

24 25

This is headed "Japanese Foreign Policy. tative Plan for Policy towards Southern Regions. Very 28 September 1940." Secret.

Where was this document prepared, if I may A ask?

It is certified as an official document of the Japanese Government and to be part of the official erchives and files of the following named ministry or department. Then we have "The Archives Section, Fcreign Office." It is further described as "Instructions from the Foreign Minister to the Envoy Extracrdinary and Ambassador Plenipotentiary, HONDA."

No, I do not believe in that. I have never even thought of it.

Well, you state that about the 18th or 19th September 1940 the Imperial Headquarters issued instructions to the NISHIHARA unit to request a reply with the deadline to be set at noon on 22 September. What particular person or persons issued those instructions?

As I have clearly stated in my affidavit, the instruction was issued by the Chief of the General Staff but following consultation with the government. Naturally, I am connected with this matter.

Q Were the instructions issued with your previous agreement or knowledge?

A Yes, as War Minister I was informed. May -- shall I state the reason?

Q You may.

I do not remember the date exactly at this present moment but with regard to the stationing -- the advance and stationing of Japanese forces in northern French Indo-China an agreement had been arrived at between the governments of the two countries. With 11 regard to the enforcement of the agreement orders were 12 issued by both governments to their representatives 13 in the field or on the spot. On the 4th of September, 1940, the agreement had generally been concluded; the agreement -- the talks had already been completed and 16 the agreement had been concluded. On the 5th of September there was some kind of action taken by the front 17 line Japanese units which appeared to have violated the 18 frontier. However, the action of the unit was taken in 19 complete ignorance of the frontier. Not one shot was 20 21 fired.

Using this action by the Japanese unit as a pretext, the French representatives on the field tried to take various measures so as to delay the execution of the agreement concluded between the two governments.

23

22

TOJO

**0** 

As for Japan, she waited impatiently for the enforcement of this -- of the agreement up to the 16th or 17th of September. The mersures just referred to were taken by the Japanese side because the French representatives on the spot would not enforce the agreement in accordance with instructions from their home government. That is the reason which I wished to state.

I believe that the dates I gave are accurate but to be doubly sure of that I wish that the Tribunal will refer to the dates given in my affidavit which are correct.

Q 'hat persons, other than yourself, advised the Emperor to declare wer on America and Britain?

A It seems to be a very important question so
I would like to have it repeated. It was not clear to
me.

(Whereupon, the Japanese court reporter read.)

A A very complex or complicated question is involved in that question, but I shall attempt to reply to it.

with regard to Japan's decision for war, as I have already clearly set forth in my affidavit, the conclusion that war was unavoidable for self-defense was arrived at after very serious and profound

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

consideration of this highly important issue by the Lisison Conference, by the Imperial Conference, by the Conference of Senior Statesmen, and by the Conference of the Supreme War Council.

Now I shall reply to the question directly. The last decision errived at after these series of conferences was reported to His Majesty, the Emperor, personally by me and by both chiefs of staff. Both chiefs of staff, that is, the Chief of the Army General Staff and the Chief of the Naval General Staff, and I told the Emperor that in order to maintain our national honor and in order to live as a nation there was no road for us to take but wer. The Emperor gave his approbation to our advice.

THE PRESIDENT: There are no further questions on behalf of the Tribunal for the time being.

MR. BLEWITT: If the Court please, I have c few questions on redirect.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Blewett.

21

22

23 24

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BLEVETT:

Q In answer to a question by his Honor, the President of this Tribunal, regarding field service instructions it appears that you did not complete your answer in so far as the responsibility is concerned for following out these instructions in the field.

A I think I completed my enswer.

Q Well, that is quite all right then. I wasn't quite sure that you had completed the second part of that answer.

A I think I concluded my reply.

Q Well, did you in your reply include the responsibility for the actual carrying out of these instructions in the field?

A The commanders in the field were responsible for the execution of the instructions in the field, that is, the field service instructions.

THE PRESIDENT: I have a further question or two.

## BY THE PRESIDENT:

Q Early in November, 1941, Tokyo instructed NOMURA that agreement must be reached with the United States by the 25th November, otherwise things would automatically begin to happen. Why was this date, 25th

-

15 16

17

19

20

22

23

November, chosen?

A That was a step or measure considered by the Foreign Minister. The Prime Minister does not know fully of the particulars. However, I can make some assumptions or presumptions.

Q Before you assume anything, was the fixation of this date connected with the order previously issued to the fleet to sail on the 26th of November?

A There is no connection whatsoever, and there can be no possibility of the Foreign Minister knowing c. it.

o well, we need not comment on that reply. That was always a possibility.

A When I said that there could not have been such a possibility, I was saying that there was no possibility, there was no room for the Foreign Minister ever to know anything about operational actions.

Q Well, would you like to add anything to what you have said? You were going to make an assumption.

I thought it might be of reference -I thought it might be of benefit to the Tribunal if I
spoke about it, but I am not necessarily volunteering
to give the explanation. If the Tribunal has a desire
to hear my explanation I am ready to proceed, but I am
not necessarily volunteering to make any statement.

Duda & Spratt

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

THE PRESIDENT: We will not compel you to

answer.

THE WITNESS: Then I shall not make any remarks.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Blewett.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. BLEWETT (Continued):

n answer to a question by His Honor, the President of this Tribunal, in which you mentioned decision of the Cabinet, the Liaison Conference, the Imperial Conference, and the Supreme War Councilors. Now, can you tell us whether or not that decision or those decisions were unanimous?

A With the exception of the Conference of the Senior Statesmen, the decisions at all other conferences were unanimous. The Conference of Senior Statesmen does not make any decisions.

Q You were asked this question by the Chief Prosecutor during his cross-examination:

"Did you think, TOJO, that any self-respecting nation that was conquered would discuss the terms of peace with a huge enemy army occupying its main cities?"

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, I object to

3 4

1

5

6

8

10

11

13

15

17

18

19

21 22

23

24

that question as a misquotation of the Chief
Prosecutor's statement at the lectern. The word "not"
was omitted, and I called it to the attention of the
stenographic group.

MR. BLEWETT: I copied it from the record, sir, but that is only a prelude to the question I am about to ask the witness with reference to the same matter.

THE PRESIDENT: You are not pressing that question, I take it, Mr. Blewett?

MR. BLEWETT: Yes, I am. I quoted the question, your Honor, to direct the attention of the witness to an answer to a subsequent question. I should say that it was in answer to that question, but the witness was shut off from giving his reasons, and I want to ask him now if he wants to give those reasons.

THE PRESIDENT: If he was prevented from answering completely, he may continue his answer now, but the point should have been raised at the time.

MR. BLEWETT: It would seem to me, sir, proper for him to explain the reasons now on redirect.

THE PRESIDENT: He can clear up anything, but on redires examination you senerally do not complete your answers on examination in chief or on cross-

examination. What you do is explain anything which you have left obscure. However, let him continue his answer, if he did not complete it.

BY IR. BLEWETT (Continued):

Q In answer to that question you said that that would depend on the term, of the peace treaty, but you were not permitted to give your reasons.

Now, do you wish to do so?

MR. KEMNAN: Mr. President, with great respect, I ask this Court to enforce the same rule with this witness as with any other. The record, I believe, will not show that he was not permitted to give his reasons. I think, Mr. President, that it may be fairly observed that if ever in the history of litigation a witness was given a fair opportunity to fully explain everything he wanted to, that opportunity has been given for several days to this accused on the witness stand.

THE PRESIDENT: The Tribunal desires that he answer Mr. Blewett, that is, complete the answers which he says he did not complete on cross-examination. So we direct that he answer.

THE WITNESS: Shall I reply?

MR. BLEWETT: You may do so.

A I used the words, "depends on the terms of

7 8

the peace," in reply to an "if" question, that is, a hypothetical question addressed to me by the prosecutor. I shall now speak of the terms.

If both Japan and China considered the stabilization of East Asia as being their highest objective, and if the terms were in accord with that objective, I believe at the time that any statesmen should agree to such terms, that is, the statesmen should agree to such a term of peace, whater may be their vicissitudes of the war.

THE INTERPRETER: We shall give a retranslation to this latter part in order to make sure there is no mistake: "Whatever may be the vicissitudes of war the statesmen of a country involved should respond in accord and comply with such terms of peace."

Q Were there many miles of improved highways and railroads built by the Japanese in Manchuria for mi wary purposes exclusively?

A No, none. The principal purpose of the roads and railroads constructed in Manchukuo were for purposes of industrial development, or the development of untapped regions. The development of these means of transportation was for the same purposes or similar purposes, or can be likened to the Russians building railroads and roads in Siberia.

Q Alluding entirely to an inference of the prosecution, did you at any time seek or engage anyone in your behalf to obtain the position of War Minister in the third KONOYE Cabinet?

A That is a most preposterous suggestion. There was no such case at all.

Q Did your fellow accused or any of them join as a group to force you into that position with a joint understanding that you were to control the foreign and domestic policies of the Japanese Government?

A I have never thought of it, never planned such a thing as just suggested by you, and I do not believe that the persons you have referred to ever conceived of coing such a thing.

Q Was your selection for that post in the slightest degree at variance with the testimony relative thereto as was cited in your affidavit?

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, I object to that question as being an improper one, a sheer waste of time.

MR. BLEWETT: I understand, sir, that of course the witness has attested to the truth of the affidavit.

THE WITNESS: Shall I reply?

MR. BLEVETT: It simply refers to it cursorily,

0

10 11

12

13

14

16

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

and some intimation has been made that other persons were influential in obtaining this position for TOJO.

I understand the purpose of the objection, and I shall not press it if the Tribunal feels that it is a waste of time and unnecessary.

Q The Chief Prosecutor has referred to the expression "niki sansuke." Did MATSUOKA and HOSHINO at any time to your knowledge engage in a plot or unlawful scheme or campaign to force you into the position of Vice-War Minister.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, I hesitate to repeat these objections, but I think it ought to be made abundantly clear that the prosecution has never claimed that this accused was forced into anything; and, therefore, these questions are highly improper and an utter waste of time.

THE PRESIDENT: In view of the attitude of the prosecution, the question is unnecessary and not allowed.

MR. BLEWETT: Sir, there is a clear intimation in the Chief Prosecutor's question as to these five men being dominant in Manchuria, and certainly an intimation and an inference that they assisted him or put him in this position for some nefarious reasons.

THE PRESIDENT: We have given our decision

.3

5

6

. 9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

20

21 22

23

and will not allow it to be debated.

IP. KEENAN: I hope, Mr. President, that the difference between the meaning of the words "force" and "assist" will be thoroughly understood without any argument to the Court or counsel.

Is the position of the Vice-War Minister considered a cabinet position or not?

THE PRESIDENT: It is unnecessary to answer the question.

At the time of holding that position, were you an army officer and under the supervision of the army as such an officer?

Yes, of course.

Are the circumstances concerning the dissolution of the YONAI Cabinet as testified to before this Tribunal by the defense witness MITARAI?

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Chief of Counsel.

MR. KEENAN: Mr. President, the prosecution objects to this question and contends it is not the privilege of this witness or any other to sum up the evidence of another witness and weigh his own judgment as to the truth and accuracy thereof; and, therefore, we object.

MR. BLEVETT: I am sure the Tribunal noted the many references throughout the witness' affidavit

9 10

7

8

12

11

13 14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

23

25

36,834

•

as to pages, numbers, exhibits, and so on, with reference to other witnesses. That was an effort, if your Honor please, to avoid repetitiveness, which ruling we have had by this Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: He can be asked whether he agrees with what another witness has said if it is really re-examination.

I do not think that line of questioning is assisting us at all, though, Mr. Blewett; I must say that.

MR. BLEWETT: Well, as I say, we thought by referring to that testimony we could save the time of this witness in making the explanation.

THE PRESIDENT: I think we are all against you on the matter.

Q On 2 January, you were asked by the Chief of Counsel as to the cause of the downfall of the YONAI Cabinet, and you several times replied that the true cause of the downfall of that cabinet was "lack of political power" or lack of power to lead Japan.

That is on record page 36,577 and 36,580. What do you mean by political power at that

A By political power and lacking in that element, I was referring to Prime Minister YONAI,

3

4

5

7

0

10

11 12

13

14

15

17

18

19

21

22

22

24

25

himself, and to the fact that the cabinet centering, around YONAI was lacking in political energy or political vitality and ability.

Q Had YOWAI support or not in so far as public opinion is concerned, or was concerned at that time?

A I do not know whether it is appropriate for me to speak of this subject, but I think that in the last stage the public opinion or the public-at-large was estranged from the YONAI Cabinet.

Q You were asked by the prosecution how the United States entry into the Se∞nd World War affected Japan.

The Chief Prosecutor does not recall that he said Second World War, but my question is really nimed at the First World War, so I shall change Second World War to First World War.

And it was suggested to you that the United States entry into the First World War did not cause any convulsion in Japan.

Was there anything regarding the entry of the United States in World War I that had any effect upon Japanese policy in connection with World War II?

A Well, I can't quite catch the question.
Were you referring to the effect on Japan of the United
States entry into the First World War? Well, anyway,

I con't get the question.

THE PRESIDENT: Repeat it after the rocess.

We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was taken until 1100, after which the proceedings were resured as follows:)

Wolf & Lefler

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE INTERPRETER: If the Tribunal please, the question of defense counsel just before the recess has been retranslated by the Language Section and will now be given to the witness.

BY MR. BLEWETT (Continued):

Q Do you wish to answer that question or not, General TOJO?

A Well, I could reply to that question, but the question as I understood it, the effect of the First World War on something at the time of the Second World War, would require a very long reply, and therefore I have no particular desire to indulge in a long dissertation. But if necessary, I will attempt to reply.

THE PRESIDENT: I do not think it will help us at all.

Q I do not think that we shall require that, General.

I have just one more question which refers to a question that was put to you yesterday by the Honorable President of this Tribunal. You were asked concerning the testimony of the witness ODAJIMA, whose testimony is on page 27;862 of the record. You were unable at that time to reply to the President because

·

36,838

1

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

you did not know the notifications referred to in the testimony.

MR. BLEWETT: Now, with the leave of the Court, if I may advise the witness as to these two notifications which is exhibit 2840, I think he will be able, sir, to complete his answer to your request yesterday.

THE PRISIDENT: Let him do so.

Q One was the notification in the name of the Vice-Elinister of War concerning the improvement of administration of prisoners of war, addressed to each commanding general of the Army who was in charge of administration of prisoners of war.

The second was a notification in the names of the Vice-Minister of War and the Vice-Chief of the General Staff concerning sea transportation of prisoners of war.

Now, with this information, do you with to add anything to your answer of yesterday to the Tribunal?

A The two notifications just referred to by you were definitely issued at that time. The front, line Commander in Chief has the responsibility of controlling prisoners of war at the front. This is an Imperial Ordinance -- this is according to the prisoner of war camps regulations, which is an Imperial Ordinance, Article 3. Furthermore, I wish to add that the Commander

1

\*

2

in Chief in charge of operations at the front has the responsibility of commanding operations and also controlling the affairs of prisoners of war.

business, I shall now relate the connection of the Minister of War. It is necessary for the War Minister to issue such instructions as these in the light of his status as a participant in the Imperial General Headquarters, and the War Vice-Minister took the step in accordance with the wishes and the will of the Minister of War. Because the matter was related to operations, the notification -- one of the notifications just referred to were issued both in the name of the Vice-Minister of War and the Vice-Chief of the General Staff of the Army. That is one example.

I should like to make it even more clear that
this action was taken by the Imperial General Headquarters, that is to say, the Army General Staff, as its
function and not that of the Government. That is all.,

MR. BLEWETT: That is all of the questions on
redirect, sir. Does the prosecution have any questions?

May the witness be excused from the box?

THE PRESIDENT: He will resume his seat in the

(Whereupon, the accused resumed his

dock.

seat in the dock.)

2

MR. BLEWETT: That is the end of the individual case of TOJO.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKFNEY: I now present the defense of General UMEZU, Yoshijiro. Neither the evidence introduced by the prosecution relating to this defendant nor the evidence which the defendant is in consequence called upon to adduce in his own behalf justifies any elaborate opening of the case. I shall therefore proceed directly with the evidence.

I now offer, first, defense document No. 2954, the affidavit of AYABE, Kentaro, whose production for eross-examination I understand is not to be desired.

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Ivanov.

colonel IVANOV: Your Honor, the prosecution objects to paragraph 3 of the affidavit of AYABE, Kentaro inasmuch as at the beginning of this paragraph the witness submits his own personal conclusion based on hearmay. As to the allusion to UNTZU's speech in 1937 at the 17th Session of the Diet at the end of this paragraph we submit that it is secondary evidence. The Tribunal has always preferred, for quite fair reasons, to get the best evidence which, in this case, would be to present

-

13

10

11

12

15 16

17

19

20

22

an excerpt from the respective minutes of the Diet session.

Furthermore, the prosecution objects to the last sentence in paragraph 2 of the affidavit as containing the witness' conclusion which is, moreover, based on hearsay.

MR. BLAKFMEY: The first objection I don't quite comprehend except that it seems to be directed against the use of the word, "rumors," in paragraph 3. The witness, of course, mentions the fact of having heard rumors as showing the matter which induced him to act, to go to this defendant and ascertain his opinions. The rumor is, of course, not mentioned here as truth of the matter contained in it, although the matter contained in it accords with the evidence heretofore adduced by the prosecution.

As to the second ground of objection, that is, to the quotation of General UMEZU's answer to interpellation in the Diet, I think counsel is under a misapprehension. It is, I think, quite clear that an interpellation in a legislative body is not a document. It is not even a speech, but is a purely extemporaneous series of questions and answers. Whatever may be the rule about proof of documents, you prove what a man said by letting someone, who heard him, testify to that fact.

19 20 21

11

13

15

. 17

18

24

22

23

As to the third ground of objection, insofar as it proceeds on the basis of hearsay, it can of course be disregarded in this Tribunal. Insofar as it points to a conclusion of the witness, I think it is well taken as to the last clause only of the last sentence of paragraph 2 of the affidavit.

That is my submission, your Honor.

,

THE PRESIDENT: Except to that extent, the objection is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms by a majority.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2954 will receive exhibit No. 3689.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3689 and received in evidence.)

MR. BLAKENEY: I reed the exhibit as admitted, omitting the formal parts.

"1. I reside at Chiba-ken Kashiwa-mechi
Toyoshiki 822. I was formerly a member of the Diet,
belonging to the Seiyukai party over an extended
period, and was Farliamentary Vice-Minister of the
Navy in the SUZUKI Cabinet.

Yoshijiro, having had occasion to meet and confer with him quite often. From this association I knew him to be much opposed to Army officers' participating in politics, and that he deplored the increasing tendency to their activities in that direction, as instanced by the '5-15 Incident' (15 May 1932) and the '2-26 Incident' (26 February 1936). During his term as Vice-Minister of War we had a talk on this subject which stands out in my mind. The General said

.

that he was doing his best to reform the Army in regard to its political activities, which, he said, owed much to the instigation of the rightist groups and parties. Army officers, being simple and straightforward, readily listened to the arguments of these people, which were of the line of resenting the present state of the world. Therefore, he said, he was taking steps to prevent the rightists from approaching Army officers; on my asking what these steps were, he smilingly answered that the Army would on no pretext give either encouragement or material support to the rightist parties or to the members of them." I omit the next word also. "Later, I heard being spread among the rightists infamous rumors discreditable to Vice-Minister UMEZU.

"3. Then, hearing rumors that a large part of the military circles disapproved of political parties and were advocating their suppression, I confirmed from Vice-Minister UMLZU what the higher levels of the Army were thinking about the matter. The General's opinion on this matter was very fair: that to abide by the Constitution was the foremost duty of the nation, and the Diet could therefore not be disregarded. So long as there was a parliament, there would be political parties, and sound political

.

-

parties were necessary to sound statesmanship. On this point, I remember that at the 70th Diet, in 1937, the question was raised in interpellation by kepresentative HAMANO, whether the Army disapproved of political parties. In answering, General UMEZU denied that he had ever had such a thought, giving great satisfaction to the political parties."

I offer in evidence the interrogatories propounded to Major General YAMAMOTO Moichiro, together with his enswers thereto, taken in Batavia on the 4th of February 1947, defense document 1834.

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Ivanov.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

COLONEL IVANOV: May it please the Tribunal,
I will have to make a rather lengthy objection and
therefore I would like to get simultaneous translation.

The prosecution objects to paragraph 3,4,6,11, 12,13 and 14 of the affidavit of the witness YAMAMOTO Moichiro, and submits that these paragraphs should be deleted from the affidavit on the following grounds:

- 1. Paragraph 3 and 4 contain the information stated by the witness in paragraph 2.
- 2. Paragraph 6 contains the reply which represents the witness' opinion without furnishing any facts which could be of any importance to the Tribunal.

Paragraph 11 also contains the witness! 1 own conclusions. As may be seen from the witness' reply UMLZU was at that time Commanding General of the 2nd Division and the witness was employed at the

4. Paragraph 12 contains information which is quite irrelevant to this inquiry.

War Ministry and had no direct relations with him.

5. Paragraph 13 contains merely a conclusion of the witness with a reservation that generally speaking he does not remember specifically what UMEZU's views amounted to.

6. In paragraph 14 the witness submits a character of his former superior referring to his personal characteristics. Furthermore, the witness goes so far as to present his own assumption as to what UMEZU might have thought with regard to a compromise with the Chiang Kai-shek Government.

May it please the Tribunal, I object to some portions of paragraphs 7 and 9 of the affidavit. In paragraph 7 only the last portion should be left, beginning with the words "In the Spring of 1937" and down to the end of this paragraph.

As to the remaining part of the witness' reply, it represents his conclusions by way of summing up and in addition to that is based on Diet records,

3

7

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

a reference to which is made in this paragraph and it should be therefore deleted.

Paragraph 9 contains an obviously leading question propounded to the witness. However, some other questions contained in the affidavit are of a similarly leading nature. In paragraph 9 the witness reply contains his personal conclusion; for example, the witness says that he knows that the policy adopted with regard to special expenses compensated without participation of the secretary was similar. It would be very hard to sort out or to single out all these conclusions and I submit that the Tribunal will disregard the conclusions of the witness in this case.

Kapleau & Yelden

MR. BLAKENEY: I will do the best I can with this inundation. I am not sure I caught it all as it went by, but I will try to answer.

THE PRESIDENT: Did you say inundation?
MR. BLAKENEY: That is right.

THE PRESIDENT: We resent counsel reflecting in that manner on the observations of other counsel.

MR. BLAKENEY: I intended no offense, of course. I intended only to suggest that I was submerged under this flood of objections, which I can't keep up with under the speed with which they were read over the IBM.

ouestions 3 and 4, or the answers thereto, are said to be repetitive. It will perhaps suffice for me to point out that this is not an affidavit drawn by me. These are interrogatories propounded by me, the answers taken not under my supervision, and of course I have no opportunity of revising it, and of course have no right to do so.

THE PRESIDENT: You have a right to tender only parts of it if you think other parts are inadmissible.

MR. BLAKENEY: I assume that on the basis of past procedure here I also have a right to do what I had intended, that is, to tender it in its entirety

and omit in reading those parts which are repetitive.

Now, the answer to question 6 is objected to, if I caught it correctly, on the grounds that it is the witness's opinion and of no interest to the Tribunal. Contrary to that allegation, I think this answer is perfectly clear that the witness is stating what he knows to be the opinion of the defendant UNEZU, and I think it hardly necessary to argue why that point is of interest to the Tribunal, because a mere reading of the affidavit will suffice to show in what way it is material and relevant. I think I made a slip of the tongue; I meant to say a mere reading of the Indictment.

Paragraph 11 I understand to be objected to on the grounds that it contains the witness's conclusions. The prosecutor points out that at the time the incident occurred General UMFZU was elsewhere than in Tokyo. However, inasmuch as the witness, as he has already said above, came to be in close association with the defendant UMFZU very soon thereafter, there is nothing in this affidevit to suggest excluding the possibility of his having heard General UMFZU's opinion on that matter directly. In fact, the whole tone of the remainder of the effidavit shows it to be the fact that it was in those circumstances that he learned the opinions of this defendant.

THE PRESIDENT: Did I understand Colonel

Ivanov to state he would not object to the Court receiving the whole document provided it intimated it
would reject the opinions that were irrelevant or
matters for the Court?

colonel IVANOV: Your Honor, the prosecution insists on the deletion of the seven paragraphs which I have listed of this affidavit. We shall agree that the remaining parts of the affidavit; which are full of various conclusions, be admitted without any changes, with the understanding the Court will disregard them.

MR. BLAKENEY: Shall I continue, your Honor?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. My inquiry has been enswered by Major Ivanov.

MR. BLAKENEY: The comment which I should make on counsel's last statement is that the record will show that in similar circumstances on very many occasions the defense objected to Pussian documents on these very grounds, to have them in the end treated just as the President has now suggested.

As to the enswer to question 12, which was said to be irrelevant, if I remember correctly, I suggest that it is relevant as showing action taken by the defendant UMEZU.

THE PRESIDENT: We have decided to admit the

whole document with the understanding that we will reject opinions which are irrelevant or are matters for us to determine. We take into account the circumstances under which the interogatories were taken, or ministered.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1834 will receive exhibit No. 3690.

("hereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3690 and received in evidence.)

MR. BLAKENEY: I read exhibit No. 3690:
"Ol You are Major-General YAMAMOTO Moichiro of the
16th Army, now held as a prisoner of war by the Netherlands forces in Java?

"A Yes.

7

8

9

10

11

12

- 13

14

15

25

"02 State what acquaintance and association you have had with General UNEZU Yoshijiro.

17. "A I first came to know General UMFZU when he was
18 appointed to the Vice-Minister of the Army in March 1936.
19 Prior to his above appointment, I had been already serv20 ing as a secretary to the "ar Minister. At that time
21 there were two secretaries to the War Minister, and one
22 worked exclusively to the War Minister as his secretary,
23 and the other carried out a secretarian job for the Vice24 Minister. In My capacity of secretary to the "ar Min-

ister, I carried out a secretarian job for the ViceMinister, UMEZU, from March 1936 till March 1937. The
"ar Minister was General TERAUCHI. In same capacity I
served exclusively to the "ar Minister, General SUGIYAMA,
as his secretary from March 1937 till May 1938. During
this latter period, General UMEZU was the Vice-Minister
of War and therefore I was in constant contact with
General UMEZU either in direct or indirect way."

I omit questions and answers 3 and 4.

"05 That was the extent of your contact with General UMEZU during that period?

"A My contact with him was limited to within my official functioning to him. As far as the private relation was concerned, there was nothing more than usually expected between the Vice-Minister and his assistant.

"C6 Can you state the attitude of Vice-Minister
UMPZU toward intervention by the Army or Army personnel
in politics?

"A There was a group among the Army that favored the intervention into the politics (such as in favour of abolishing the political party); however, General UMEZU had taken quite a right opposing attitude against same. He was of strong opinion that such idea was wrong not only for the country, but also harmful to the Army

itself and he endeavoured himself to make his idea thoroughly known and understood among the Army. 

"Q7 Give the substance of anything which you may remember having heard General UMEZU say on this subject.

"A He was of opinion that the Army and soldiers should keep themselves aloof above the politics, and that they should concentrate their whole energy on performing their original duties. In his view, this is to make the progress of country sound and healthy and also to make the operation of the politics bright and just.

"Participation of the Army and soldiers in the politics, in his view, would damage the silent dignity of the Army, and consequently it would result in the fact that the Army would be drawn into the politics. If the necessity that the Army should participate in the politics should arise, it would be considered as the misfortune of the country and moreover, he was of opinion that the time had not yet at hand even to consider the necessity of administering the Army power into the political affairs. These thoughts are clearly comprehended from the instructions of the War Minister (TERAUCHI) and other various orders which were issued in the year of 1936, particularly in the first half of the same year. It was also clearly instructed by him that the Army officials who were allowed to participate in politics should be

3 5

1

2

6

7

8 9

10

12

11

13 14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

limited to the War Minister, the Vice-Minister, and some officials of the Military Affairs Bureau (Gunmukyoku) who had official responsibility of participating in politics. This will be proved clearly if reference is made to the replies of the War Minister and other officials which had been delivered to the Parliament in these days. On the occasion when the general election (HAYASHI Cabinet) had been held in the spring of 1937, the Vice-Minister, UMEZU, had requested that the Army should take the neutral attitude strictly. I and other officials in the Army who had been in the posts in which the participation in politics had been permitted, were repeatedly admonished by the Vice-Minister in this particular regard. For instance, it was warned by him that collecting political information in the Parliament should not be carried out any more than necessary for the sake of assisting the War Minister. I remember that when the HAYASHI Cabinet was being formed a severe admonition had been given by him regarding the limit and extent to which collection of information was to be carried out.

"Q8 The Vice-Minister of War was responsible for the safekeeping and disbursement of the special fund of the Ministry, was he not?

3

6

9

11

13 14

15 16

17

19

21

22

23

25

"A Yes. However, the duty of keeping the cash had been the responsibility of the senior adjutant of the War Ministry.

UMEZU's management of this special fund, particularly in connection with contributions to politicians and others outside the Ministry. Include what you know on the following points: The uses to which this fund had been put by previous Vice-Ministers; the extent to which and ways in which General UMEZU decreased disbursement of this fund; what his purpose was in so doing, as expressed to you; the result of his attitude and measures, including the reaction of his superiors and other senior officers of the high command, politicians and others.

"A The payment of the secret fund which had been participated in by a secretary was limited mostly to the entertaining expense and other lots of small amount, between ¥500 and ¥100 per one lot which had been paid to the people outside the Army, and the total amount of such was not so much. However I believe that the policy adopted by him regarding the special fund which had been paid without secretary's taking part in, must have been the same.

"The policy adopted by General UMEZU was to

.10

curtail these expenses, and also to avoid payment which was likely to lead to the Army's participation in the politics, or the other expenses paid to the people outside the Army. (Much had been paid then to the right wing.) He carried out this policy strictly. The entertainment parties had been reduced in number, the guest had been restricted, and the place where the parties were held had been considerably restricted. In case of people outside the Army (including groups outside the Army) requesting the payment of the special fund, full explanation had been given to him by secretary as to the character of the person concerned, the purpose of its expense, and other details. If the Vice-Minister was not fully convinced, the payment was not permitted, and his policy was particularly strict towards the political relations and the right wings. I remember in this connection that much efforts on the part of secretary had been exerted.

"The Vice-Ministers prior to UMEZU (KOISO and others) had been loose comparatively in this respect, and they agreed with discretion of secretary on most occasions, and except in case of a large amount involved, much detailed explanation were not demanded. And the payment to the political relations

3 4

1

5

7 8

9

10

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

21

20

22

24

and the right wings had been comparatively much. There were two kinds of payment of the secret fund which had been participated in by secretary. One was of customary nature and the other of temporary one. The curtailment of these expenses had been practiced in the following way. As regards the customary one, a fundamental investigation had been made as to person or group that received same, and discernment had been clearly marked between one to be discontinued and others to be curtailed. (I remember there were some of the scientific nature which were left uncurtailed.) Among the lot which was to be discontinued, there were some which were considered difficult to do so immediately (in relation to the nature of enterprise), and such expenses had been discontinued gradually over the period of two or three months. The other lot which was to be curtailed had been gradually cut down, and in the end, he had reduced the same to one-half or one-third. In this way, it is thought, the payment of the secret fund had been reduced at least to one-third in total amount, as compared with the former times.

"What he aimed at in carrying out the above policy was that there were not only some payments which were considered unnecessary from the original

25

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

§ 19

20

21

22

23

with the possibility that the payment to those outside the Army, even though some were justified and useful, would lead the outsiders to misunderstand the action and standpoint of the Army, and particularly that the payment to the political relations would result in the Army being drawn into the politics unwittingly, this last point being the reason why he considered the curtailment necessary as a part of regulation of the Army discipline.

"His above-mentioned attitude, of course, had been supported by the War Minister. Among other Army superiors, politicians, and people outside the Army, many had supported his policy, maintaining that same was proper steps for the sake of eliminating unnecessary misunderstanding towards the Army. Particularly the conscientious politicians had favored him with their confidence. However it was a fact that there were some among the Army and people outside it who opposed to him, by reasons either that it was too strict or undue nervousness on his part, or that it was unadvisable for the Army to withdraw itself from the politics.

"Q10 Did General UMEZU state his view to be that the Army must be rid of such people as had been

.

with the possibility that the payment to those outside the Army, even though some were justified and useful, would lead the outsiders to misunderstand the action and standpoint of the Army, and particularly that the payment to the political relations would result in the Army being drawn into the politics unwittingly, this last point being the reason why he considered the curtailment necessary as a part of regulation of the Army discipline.

"His above-mentioned attitude, of course, had been supported by the War Minister. Among other Army superiors, politicians, and people outside the Army, many had supported his policy, maintaining that same was proper steps for the sake of eliminating unnecessary misunderstanding towards the Army. Particularly the conscientious politicians had favored him with their confidence. However it was a fact that there were some among the Army and people outside it who opposed to him, by reasons either that it was too strict or undue nervousness on his part, or that it was unadvisable for the Army to withdraw itself from the politics.

"Q10 Did General UMEZU state his view to be that the Army must be rid of such people as had been

- \*\*

receiving contributions from the special fund, to avoid entanglement in politics?

"A Yes. As above mentioned, he thought it necessary for the sake of not only ensuring the Army tot being drawn into the politics but also for avoiding to cause misunderstanding as if the Army were participating in the politics.

"Q11 What can you say of General UMEZU's views on the 26 February 1936 incident?

"A He regretted the incident and had taken a right opposing attitude against this action. It was a well-known fact that he considered the regulation of the Army discipline one of his important duties for the sake of reestablishment of the Army, thereby not only eliminating the direct cause of this incident, but also clearing up the basic factors for the possible future reoccurrence of action of same nature.

The was the commanding officer of No. 2

Division when the incident occurred and his usual

idea can be seen from a telegram which he had sent

then to the War Minister, submitting his opinion to

the effects that he opposed the direct action of such

nature and that the case should be immediately re
pressed and its propagation should be prevented by

all means. And his countermeasures against the

incident had been embodied fully in his regulation of the Army discipline and other various steps which had been adopted afterward in order to settle the incident.

"Q12 Did those views take practical expression in connection with the use of the special fund, or other available funds for payment of pensions to widows of Army personnel executed for participation in the 26 February 1936 incident?

"A As a principle, this affair was a problem to be investigated by the Military Affairs Bureau 'Gunmukyoku', and therefore as a secretary I had nothing to do with the same. Also I have no clear memory about same. There was a plan of a group of the right wings to raise the fund for the sake of supporting the widows, and I remember in this connection that upon hearing same, he opposed, intervened, and stopped the plan to materialize."

THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until halfpast one.

(Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.)

-

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International

Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: If your Honor please, I resume the reading of exhibit No. 3690 on page 4 with question 13.

"Question 13. Did you hear General UMEZU express an opinion concerning the so-called Kodoha or Toseiha?

"Answer. Although I do not remember his idea in any concrete form, he was of opinion that their deeds and words were devoid of general viewpoint, short of calm logics, and dogmatic, and therefore harmful for the unity within the country and disadvantageous for the sake of the country. I could see on various occasions that he was in disagreement with them, and opposed to the Army personnels having any special relation with them.

"Question 14. Can you give any other information materia" to the defense of General UMEZU on charges of having planned and conspired to bring about aggressive wars?

30

0

02

&3

W 4

h<sub>5</sub>

16

n 7

9

10

11

12

13

15

16 17

18

20

21

23

24

.25

"Answer. He had comprehension full of good will towards China. Regarding the China Incident, he had same tendency of thought with Prince KONOYE and it seemed to me that he was considering even compromise with Chiang Kai-shek Government for the sake of its carly settlement. In this respect, I judged then that he was a person who understood Prince KONOYE. Though it was a matter of minor importance, he feared that the word 'eight corners of the world under one roof' (HAKKOIU) would give such wrong impression as to mean the aggression by Japan in a form of the world domination, and therefore he prohibited the use of that word in the instructions and others" -- I think he means orders -- "in those days. This episode might serve as one help in observing the tendency of his inner thoughts.

"His personrlity was of extremely deep insight and strong will, taking no decision lightly, observing things most cautiously from various angles, and judging from general standpoint. Once decided, he carried it out with strong conviction. The measures taken based on his decision were not simple, and had various steps in reserve, considered fully, to cope with all varying conditions.

"In practicing his measures, he operated same

2 3 4

1

6

8

9

11

13

12

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

24

timely, accurately and minutely. It was difficult, therefore, for other people to easily find out his own idea. However, whatever he had put into practice was fair and just, and it was sound and thorough with commanding logical basis.

"In case of offering my opinion to him, he used to tell me that he would never stick to his own opinion provided he was convinced that my opinion was better than his own.

"His personality of soundness can only be understood by long and deep contact with him, and therefore when he was the Vice Minister there were many who often had difficulty in seeing his true intention, inasmuch as he did not express his opinion lightly, although he had his decision already made in his mind. The deeper you come in contact with him, the better you know the greatness of his personality. When he was the Vice Minister the politicians who had contact with him had deep reliance and high respect for his vision and talent."

I call as a witness NISHIO, Toshizo, whose testimony is contained in his affidavit, defense document No. 2908.

25

2

3

6

7

. 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

TOSHIZO NISHIO, called as a witness on
behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn,
testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:
DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BLAKENEY:

Q Please state your name, Mr. Witness.

A NISHIO, Toshizo.

MR. BLAKENEY: I ask that he be handed defense document No. 2908.

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

Q I ask you, Mr. Witness, to examine that document and state whether it is your affidavit, signed, sealed and executed by you?

A This is my affidavit.

Q And are the contents thereof true and correct?

A Yes.

Mk. BLAKENEY: I offer in evidence defense document No. 2908.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2908

will receive exhibit No. 3691.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3691 and received in evidence.)

11

12

13

9

10

1

3

4

5

6

14

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

MR. BLAKENEY: I read the exhibit which, omitting the formal parts, is as follows:

"1. In January 1937, when General UGAKI received an Imperial order to form a cabinet, I was the Vice Chief of the General Staff. I state herein the circumstances within the army at that time.

"At that time the Chief of the General Staff was Prince KAN-IN, the War Minister was General TERAUCHI and the Inspector-General of Military Education was General SUGIYAMA. General UMEZU was the Vice Minister of War. Among the central authorities of the army there were strong opinions in opposition to General UGAKI's cabinet-formation. At that time, after the 26 February Incident, the central authorities of the army intended and endeavored for the enforcement of internal control of the army. However, much misunderstanding was prevalent about General UGAKI in the form of rumors regarding the so-called 'March Incident'. Therefore, once the news of General UGAKI's cabinetformation was known, officers in minor positions, below chiefs of sections and bureaus, opposed his formation of a cabinet, and circumstances looked quite serious.

"I conferred with UMEZU, the Vice Minister of War, about this problem, considering the necessity of

2

3

5

6

8

10

11

12 13

14

16

17 18

> 19 20

21

22

24

controlling the whole army. Both I and General UMEZU 2 had good will for General UGAKI and were not opposed personally to his forming a cabinet. Nevertheless, if it were to be completed without consideration of the circumstances within the army, it would be impossible to avoid disorder or lack of control of the army. Therefore, we concluded the problem should be handled by the conference of three leading generals of the army, and no subordinates or younger officers should have any connection with the matter. We strictly prohibited any undercurrents in the army.

13

10

11

12

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

"After that the problem was handled by Generals TERAUCHI and SUGIYAMA. Though, as no consultation was had by them with their subordinates, I did not know of the fact at first, I was told that the generals visited UGAKI and explained the serious circumstances of the Army, requesting him to reconsider the matter of his cabinet-formation. I was also told that the general's negotiated with some candidates for war Minister, who however did not accept the post, giving as the reason the difficulties of internal control of the Army. Thus, I was told, in such circumstances General UGAKI abandoned the attempt to organize a cabinet. In addition, this disturbance within the Army spread to the ex-soldiers. And since the Ex-Soldiers' Association was quite worried about the state of affairs an explanetion was made, I knew, under the name of the Vice-Minister about the particulars of the problem.

Army, Lieutenant General UMIZU was the Commander of the China Garrison. When War Minister HAYASHI came to Hsinking for an inspection of Manchuria, at the end of May 1935, the Kwantung Army reported to him the circumstances at that time. Commander UMEZU also was called to Hsinking by the Minister to report, and saw him. At that time I also met Commander UMEZU; the

5

7

9

10

12 13

14

16

17 18

> 20 21

19

22

23 24

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

meeting, however, did not go beyond a mere greeting, and no conference was had with the Kwentung Army with respect to policies, etc. Commander UMEZU left Hsinking right after the meeting with the Minister, and returned to his post."

You may cross-examine.

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Ivanov.

## CROSS-LXAMINATION

## BY COLONEL IVANOV:

Q Witness, you mention in your affidavit that you were formerly Chief of Staff of the Kwantung Army. Didn't you hold this post from 5 March 1934 to 23 March 1936?

A Yes, as you say.

Q Wasn't General MINAMI, whose name you avoid to mention in your affidavit, commanding general of the Kwantung Army during practically the whole of this period?

A The commanding general of the Kwantung Army for the first year was General HISHIKARI. The commanding general from the second year and thereafter was General MIN'MI.

Q In your affidavit you likewise don't mention the meeting of General UMEZU with General MINAMI in

2

3

7

10

11

12

13

14

May 1935 in Hsinking. Don't you know about this meeting?

A I am not informed of any special interview.

Q I mean the visit of UMEZU in May 1935 in Hsinking where UMEZU arrived, called by War Minister HAYASHI to whom he had to report about the position in North China.

A I know of the visit paid by General UMEZU to General HAYASHI to make a report in May 1936. Of that I have stated in my affidavit.

THE MONITOR: War Minister HAYASHI instead of General HAYASHI.

Q But did General UMFZU meet General MINAMI in that time and did they discuss the situation in North China?

A I do not know of any such a thing.

Q Do you mean to say that you want us to believe that you are not aware even that such a meeting took place?

A At that time I did not know that there was such a fact -- that there was such a meeting as you have referred to.

Q Do you know about it now, don't you?

A No, I do not know.

Q Didn't the routine business and etiquette

15

17

19 20

21

23 24

require the courtesy call on the part of General UMEZU in this case?

General UMFZU met Commending General MINAMI, but they met probably to exchange greetings. That I do believe. But I do not know of any situation or of any fact of the two meeting to discuss especially the situation in North Chine.

Q Will you tell us what the specific purpose was of var Minister HAYASHI's inspection trip in Menchuria in May 1935?

THE MONITOR: Before the witness said, "I couldn't hear the question."

COLONEL IVANOV: I ask that the Japanese court reporter repeat the question.

(Whereupon, the Japanese court remorter read.)

A Well, I did not hear at that time what specifically was the purpose of his visit, but according to the information we received he came to Manchukuo to inspect the condition of the Kwantung Army as well as Manchukuo, and reports were accordingly made to him of those situations and conditions.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

24

Q Did HAYASHI visit army units stationed in northern, eastern or southern Manchuria?

A He did not.

Q Will you tell us whether any issues could be concealed from you in your capacity of the Chief of Staff of the Kwantung Army, concealed by Commanding General UMFZU and MINAMI?

RUSSIAN MONITOR: Issues concerning the talks between General UMFZU and General MINAMI.

A Wes the present question to the effect that General MINAMI had something to hide from me -- that General MINAMI had some reason to hide, conceal, certain information from me? Is that what you mean by your question?

Q Yes, in particular I mean exactly this.

A There was no case of Commanding General MINAMI concealing anything special from me.

Q In this case will you tell us whether General MINAMI discussed with the War Minister the situation in North China and the measures that the Japanese military were going to take there?

A I believe that there was nothing of the kind.

Q Did the War Minister inspect the construction of military objectives and against what state was it carried on by the Kwantung Army under General MINAMI?

\*

12

14

9

10

11

15

17

18

20

21 22

23

2.5

3

10

11

12 13

14 15

16 17

19

20

18

21 22

23

24 25

MR. BLAKENEY: If the Tribunal please, I don't think this has any connection with the affidavit and I therefore object to it.

COLONEL IVANOV: Your Honor, I believe it is necessary to clarify the purpose of War Minister HAYASHI's inspection trip to Manchuria, and also should be clarified the meeting of War Minister HAYASHI with two commanding generals of continental armies -- Japanese armies on the continent, the problem which still remains a mystery. Otherwise that inspection trip of the War Minister seems to be quite unwarranted.

THE PRESIDENT: Unless you connect the accused UMFZU with it it will be immaterial and irrelevant too.

COLONEL IVANOV: I will pass over to the next question, your Honor.

You mention in your effidavit that the Kwantung Army submitted a report of the situation to the War Minister. Did this report emanate from Commanding General MINAMI or from you as his chief of staff?

It was a report submitted by the commanding general of the Kwantung Army.

Were military preparations of the Kwantung Army characterizing its combat preparedness against the Soviet Union in China outlines in this report?

No.

Q And what was the contents of that report then if you say that the central issue with regard to the activity of the Kwantung Army wasn't mentioned in it?

MR. BLAKENEY: If the Tribunal please, I object to this line of questioning also as being without the scope of the direct testimony and, therefore, improper cross-examination.

Tribunal, your Honor, that the meeting of two commanding generals with the War Minister HAYASHI certainly was concerned with some general matters connected with the coordination of actions of both armies, and I believe that we are fully entitled to deal with the issues which throw light upon the coordination of actions of these two armies.

THE PRESIDENT: In paragraph 2 it is stated by the witness that "no conference was had with the Kwantung Army with respect to policies, etc." Is your cross-examination directed to that? If it is we cannot stop it.

COLONEL IVANOV: Yes, exactly as you say, your Honor.

MR. BLAKENEY: In that connection, if the Tribunal please, I should point out that the last question concerned the contents of the report made by the

Kwantung Army to the War Minister. The passage your Honor has pointed out relates to the defendent UMEZU who was neither with the Kwentung Army nor the War Ministry.

COLONEL IVANOV: I will reshape the question,

Q Tere in the report submitted to the war Minister outlined the data with regard to the situation in North China which were in the possession of the Kwentung Army?

A No.

Q Had the Kwantung Army any sourcesfrom which it could derive any information with regard to the situation in North China?

A We merely received notification from the China Garrison.

Q In other words, from General UMEZU?

A Information was received and exchanged with the organ concerned of the headquarters of the China Garrison.

Q Why do you avoid to mention the name of General UMEZU? It is generally known that General UMEZU was commanding general of Japanese troops in Hsinking.

A I am not trying to avoid mentioning the name of UMEZU because it wasn't known as the UMFZU Army

14

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

24

2.5

5

8

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Headquarters but the China Garrison Headquarters. That is why I use the official name. However, General UMEZU was Commander of that

garrison in Tientsin, wasn't he?

Yes.

NISHIO

Did you receive information as to the situation in North China only from General UMEZU's Headquarters or the Kwantung Army had its own sources of information in that area of China?

Information was received from the Headquarters of the North China Garrison. There the Kwantung Army did not have any special intelligence or information organ within the jurisdiction of General UMEZU's command in North China.

Q Did the South Manchurian Railway Company have its branch offices in different parts of China, and did it receive from them political, military, and economic information?

MR. BLAKENEY: If the Tribunal please, I don't like to interfere with counsel's cross-examination, but I submit this is wholly beyond the scope of the affidavit.

COLONEL IVANOV: Your Honor, I believe that this question is relevant because it is connected and it is within the scope of the affidavit, because this

22 23

25

question deals with the situation in North China where General UNEZU was Commanding General, and then I must say that this question purports to test the credibility of this witness.

THE PRESIDENT: The objection is allowed.

Q Wasn't a special service organ established in February, 1935, and didn't the Kwantung Army and Commanding General UNEZU participate in its establishment -- established in North China?

MR. BLAKENEY: I have to make the same objection, if the Tribunal please. It is beyond the scope of the affidavit.

COLONEL IVANOV: But, your Honor, this is the only source of information which the witness possessed, who at that time, in 1935, held the post of the Kwantung Army Chief of Staff.

THE PRESIDENT: The objection is sustained.

Q Will you tell us, Nr. Witness, did General UMEZU and MINAMI carry on subversive activities in North China under their special service organs?

MR. BLAKENEY: The same objection is made to this, if the Tribunal please.

THE PRESIDENT: Objection sustained.

COLONEL IVANOV: May the witness be shown prosecution document No. 1054(39).

1 2 3

4

6

8

9

10

11

13

15

16 17

18

19

21

22

24

(Whereupon, a document was handed

to the witness.)

Q Mr. Witness, examine this document and tell us whether it bears an inscription showing that it eminated from the Kwantung Army Headquarters.

In order to answer my question, it is sufficient for you to examine the first page of the document.

A This was not a document which was sent out by the Kwantung Army.

Q Please look at the first page of the document and answer my question whether on the first page of the document there is an indication in the title of the document that the document eminated from Kwantung Army Headquarters -- belongs to the Kwantung Army Headquarters.

Wasn't this document received at the War Ministry and doesn't it bear the seals of the Secretariat of the War Ministry and some of its sections?

A There is a seal which seems to indicate that this document was seen by the Military Affairs Bureau of the War Office. I cannot vouch for the other seals because I do not know anything about them.

colonel IVANOV: Your Honor, I offer in evidence prosecution document No. 1054(39), entitled,

3

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

2.5

"Outline of Guidance of Intelligence Service of Chiang Kai-shek's Regime." This document characterizes the subversive activity of the Japanese Army in China, which was directed in 1935 by General UMEZU, and subversive activity of the Kwantung Army headed by MINAMI against China.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: If I understand correctly, the date of this document is 1931, and although of course I haven't had an opportunity to peruse it, I judge from looking at it that it has no connection whatsoever with the testimony of this witness. The right to have the witness identify documents which are going to be offered in evidence must, I assume, be restricted to documents relative to the testimony of the witness now on the stand, and I therefore object to this as not being so relevant.

MR. BROOKS: If the Tribunal please, I would like to enter the same objection on behalf of General MINAMI. I haven't had a chance to review the document, but I would like to have the document, however, marked for identification, since it has been shown to this witness, and it might be offered at a later period if the witness has any comment about it.

THE PRESIDENT: How can you connect this

draument now tondered with the witness's affidavit.

COLORED DVANOV: Your Honor, I invite the attention of the Tribunal that in this document are authired the facts of the activity of bus Jamenese Litel Lecon Service in China relating to 1935 and to the earlier period. It can easily be proved if we look of prigos 5, 7, and 9 and other pages of this document -- I from the English toxt of the document. From the bustants of this bounent it may be seen that the subjective notivity in China was directed by Communiting Jonoval Mille in North China, and also the Commander of the Workhard Joyr in 1955, when General MINAIN was the Corn whing General of the Ewantum Army. This document clariftes all sources of information worker General Utility bad in China, and through which be conducted his subversive activity, and class the sources of ind mouth not the Kwantung Army, the Chief of Staff of which was the present witchess.

toled to outline who statuthen to Meste Chine, but if you went to be more expet we must say that the witness brief to every outlines the real situation in North Chine.

THE PRESIDENCE 210 although has deposed to

5 6 7

1

2

3

9

8

11 12

13 14

15

17

19

21 22

23

t h

two matters, and they are in paragraphs 1 and 2 of his affidavit. You must connect this with one or the other of those paragraphs. It doesn't have any connection with one; it doesn't appear to me to have any connection with two at present. This witness, being an ex-vice-chief of staff, may have a fund of information, and this document may also contain a fund of information, but we have to apply the American rule which restricts cross-examination to the affidavit itself or to matters arising out of it. It is useless, Colonel, to tell us how important this document is if you cannot connect it with paragraph 2 of this affidavit.

in Tientsin, the War Minister of Japan had a conference with two generals, General ULEZU and General MINAMI. There is no doubt whatsoever, your Honor, that in the course of that conference issues relating to the situation in North China were discussed. This document bears witness to the same subject, and this document belonged to the War Ministry and to the Kwantung Army Headquarters.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is sustained, and the document rejected.

7 8

9 10

11 12

14

13

15 16

> 17 18

19 20

21 22

23 24

25

COLONEL IVANOV: I ask that this document be marked for identification. I believe that the previous question laid sufficient foundation for the presentation of this document in rebuttal in a few cays.

CROSS

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 1054(39) will receive exhibit No. 3692 for identification only.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3692 for identification.)

Will you tell us, Mr. "itness, whether General UNEZU started the movement for autonomy in North China simultaneously and together with General MINAMI?

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

KR. BLAKENEY: Objected to as being without the scope of the affidavit.

THE PRESIDENT: Objection sustained.

Do you know the former general of the Japanese Lrmy, KAWAGISHI, Bunsaburo?

> Yes, I know him. A

Was he commander of the Mixed Brigade of the Kwantung Army?

Yes, he was.

3

6

/

9

11

12

14

15

16

19

20

22

24 25 Q Was this Mixed Brigade sent out to the city of Hupeikow in June 1935, the city which is near the Great Chinese Wall?

A At the verge of Hupeikow a part of the KAWAGISHI brigade was engaged in garrison duty from peacetime.

THE INTERPRETER: Correction: A part of the KAWAGISHI brigade from mormal times carried on guard duty and garrisoned the village of Hupeikow.

COLONEL IVANOV: I conclude the examination of the present witness, your Honor.

MR. BLAKENEY: May the witness be excused on the usual terms?

THE PRESIDENT: He is excused accordingly.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. BLAKENEY: Defense document 2958, an excerpt from the SAIONJI-HARADA Memoirs, is offered in evidence. The date of the chapter from which this excerpt is taken, which was inadvertently omitted from the excerpt, is 24 June 1935.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Chapter 174 of the

SAIONJI-HARADA Memoirs will receive exhibit No. 3693

for identification only. The excerpt therefrom, being defense document 2958, will receive exhibit No. 3693-A

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3693 for identification; and the excerpt therefrom, being defense document No. 2958, was marked defense exhibit No. 3693-A and received in evidence.)

MR. BLAKENEY: I read the exhibit:

"Moreover, I met the Premier and he said:

'The North China issue will be settled with all demands acceded to. As in many cases, when I (Premier)

inquired into the matter, I found out that just before General UMEZU entrained for Hsingking, Chief of Staff SAKAI said to him (UMEZU): 'I would like very much to issue an exceedingly light, friendly warning during your absence. What do you think?" To this, Commander UMEZU replied: "If that is the case, it will be all right." From the foregoing, such a serious thing resulted.!"

The Chief of Staff of the North China Garrison, SAKAI, Takashi, mentioned in the preceding document, was subpoened on 3 September 1946, immediately upon publication of the fact that General SAKAI was to be executed. The defense were unable to obtain his testimony, as will appear from defense document 2897, which is offered in evidence.

3 4

7 8

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2897

will receive exhibit No. 3694.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3694 and received in evidence.)

MR. BLAKENEY: This is a letter from the Chinese Mission in Japan, addressed to GHQ, SCAP, dated the 19th of September, 1946, from which I shall read paragraphs 1 and 2.

memorandum AG 000.5 (4 Sept. 46) LS-R of 4 September 1946 requesting that the execution of the sentence imposed on the former Japanese General SAKAI be delayed and that he be transported to Tokyo to give testimony before the International Military Tribunal. The memorandum reached this mission in the afternoon of September 5 and the request was accordingly wired to Nanking for consideration.

"2. This mission has just been informed by the Chinese Government that the execution of General SAKAI took place on the morning of 13 September 1946, as previously scheduled. It is regretted that the intervening time was insufficient to obtain the desired stay of execution through the necessary channels."

2 3

I offer in evidence defense document 1820, being the sworn statement of E. J. Nathan.

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Ivanov.

colonel IVANOV: Your Honor, the prosecution objects to the introduction of this document as it contains character evidence concerning UMEZU and then it is obviously biased and has no probative value for the Tribunal.

MR. BLAKENEY: I will answer the first part of the objection by conceding that there is in this document of there which might be treated as character evidence; to wit, starting with the second sentence from the end and from there to the end. The remainder, I submit, is clearly admissible.

THE PRESIDENT: How is the first part relevant

MR. BLAKENEY: One of the charges made here, at least inferentially, is that foreign industry was oppressed and that the attempt was made by the Japanese to drive it from areas under their control.

THE PRESIDENT: The Kailan Mining Administration could be wholly Japanese-owned, for all this indicates, assuming that it is relevant.

MR. BLAKENEY: I think the document itself shows that the Kailan Mining Company was not Japanese,

ince the joint chief manager was an Englishman.

THE PRESIDENT: The objection to the whole document is sustained and it is rejected.

MR. BLAKENEY: An additional statement of Mr. Nathan, defense Cocument No. 1071, is offered in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Ivanov.

colonel IVANOV: Your Honor, the prosecution objects to the introduction of this document on the same grounds as to the previous document. This document also has no probative value for the Tribunal, and, moreover, it contains personal opinions and conclusions of the witness.

MR. BLAKENEY: To the extent that the document contains opinions and conclusions, of course, I
do not attempt to defend it. To the extent that it
shows the defendant UMEZU as attempting to prevent
Japanese Army and army officers' participation in
these affairs in North China, I do think it is relevant
to the charges here.

THE PRESIDENT: It seems very trivial. The objection is overruled and the document admitted for what it is worth.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1071 will receive exhibit No. 3695.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3695 and received in evidence.)

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen

(Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

minutes,

W f & L efil

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

I was about to read exhibit No. MR. BLAKENEY: 3695.

"In March 1938 I was on a visit to Tokyo in connection with the affairs of the Kailan Mining Administration, Tientsin, North China, of which I was at that time Joint Chief Manager. On my arrival in Tokyo I called on General UNEZU who was then Vice-Minister of War and with whom I had had both social and official relations some years previously, when he was G.O.C. Imperial Japanese Forces, North China, stationed in Tientsin. He subsequently entertained me at luncheon and on that occasion I was able to renew the pleasant relations that I had previously enjoyed with him. Shortly afterwards I received a telegram from my colleague in Tientsin informing me that a serious strike h broken out at our mines and that there was a strong sus picion that some Japanese officers were mixed up in it. I at once asked to see General UNEZU who, I remember, received me in his own house on a Sunday morning. I explained the position to him and asked for his help in getting Japanese influence withdrawn from the strike. He promised me that, if after investigation he was

PA

20

21 22

23 24

satisfied that the strike was not due to economic causes but to political activities in which Japanese were concorned, he would take steps to have the Japanese influence removed. On my return to Tientsin, the strike being still on, I endeavored to persuade the Chief of the Japanese Special Mission who was the officer in charge of Affairs in our mines area that, in fact, the strike had no economic foundation but was purely political in nature, and I named to him the Japanese officers whom I believed were concerned in it. Failing to get satisfaction from this official, I repeated my request to General UNEZU for help and asked him to implement his promise to me. This he subsequently did and after the strike had collapsed, one of the officers named by me was removed from the area and was, I believe, given an inferior position elsewhere."

I will omit the last paragraph.

In offering in evidence defense document No. 1090, a sworn statement by Major General F. S. G. Piggo I think it is proper to restrict the tender to the firstwo sentences only.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1070 will receive exhibit No. 3696.

(Whereupon, the document above

24

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3696 and received in evidence.)

MR. BLAKENFY: This exhibit is a statement of Major General Piggott, dated the 24th of December, 1946.

"I first met General UMIZU (Yoshijiro) in 1936 when he was Vice-Minister of War. I found him invariably courteous and anxious to co-operate in solving any problems that militated against good relations."

My next witness was to be SHIBAYAMA, Kenshiro, but inasmuch as he is reported indisposed, I shall have to postpone his testimony until some later time.

I now offer in evidence defense document No. 1069, the affidavit of the witness IINUMA, Mamoru, whose attendance for cross-examination, I understand, is not desired.

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Ivanov.

Tribunal that in the affidavit of IINIMA, Mamoru, in slightly disguised form, is given character evidence concerning UMFZU. Therefore, the prosecution objects to the introduction of the greater part of the affidavit beginning with the words, "In making the selection of a man for this place the following points were considered, until the words, "These being the requirements, I recommended Lieutenant-General UMEZU."

5 6

MR. BLAKENEY: There is no question of disguise or of character evidence. Here we have the man whose official position required him to make a selection and whom circumstances compelled to make a certain type of selection.

Not only, therefore, do I submit that it is proper for him to testify upon what basis that selection was made, but also the method of selecting the Commander in Chief of the Kwantung Army and the intentions with which that selection was made must, I submit, be very relevant on the question of conspiracy as of that date.

I think clearly it would be open to the prosecution to introduce evidence showing that a Commander in Chief of the Kwantung Army was selected because of his ability to irritate the Soviet Union, and if that be so, I submit it must be material to show that a Commander in Chief was selected for precisely the opposite reasons.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is sustained.

MR. BLAKENEY: May I just, for the record, add the one further sentence which I wished to suggest as another reason for the admissibility of the document?

THE PRESIDENT: It is too late now. You may read the balance of the document.

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

15

17

19

20 21

22 23

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1069 will receive exhibit No. 3697.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3697 and received in evidence.)

MR. BLAKFIEY: I will omit reading it. It has no significance.

I offer in evidence the affidavit of TAKABE, Rokuzo, defense document No. 2010.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2910 will receive exhibit No. 3698.

(Whercupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3698 and received in evidence.)

MR. BLANDNEY: I read the affidavit which, omitting the formal parts, is as follows:

"C Did General UNFZU, Commander-in-Chief of the kwantung Army, give to you as Chief of General Affairs of Manchukuo instructions concerning the relatito be maintained between Manchukuo and the U.S.S.R., during his term?

"A The Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army, General UFEZU, gave to me instructions upon my taking the position of Chief of General Affairs of

9

, 8

6

7

10

12

13

15

16

18

19

21

23

Manchukuo to the effect that now was the time that the Government of Manchukuo should be most careful not to irritate the U.S. S. R. in matters of dissemination of information and propaganda.

now did you guide and instruct your men?

"A I conveyed the instructions to the viceministers of all the departments."

I call as a witness TAKEI, Scitaro, whose testimony is contained in his affidavit, defense document No. 2959.

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

SEITARO TAKEI, called as a witness on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

## BY MR. BLAKENEY:

- Q Please state your name, Mr. Witness.
- A TAKEI, Seitaro.
- O Where do you reside?
- A I reside at No. 38 Tokiwa-cho, Takasaki, Gumma Prefecture.

MR. BLAKENEY: Let him be shown defense docu-

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

Q Please examine that, Mr. Witness, and state whether it is your affidavit, bearing your signature and seal.

- A This is o.k.
- Q Are the contents thereof true and correct to the best of your knowledge?
  - A Yes, true and correct.

MR. BLAKENEY: I offer in evidence the affidavit, defense document No. 2959.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

4

23

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2959 will receive exhibit No. 3699.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3699 and received in evidence.)

The BLAKENEY: I read the affidavit, omitting the formal parts.

"I served as an operations staff officer of the Kwantung Army from August 1940 to August 1943. I state here about the outbreak of the Pacific War and the relation of the Kwantung Army to it.

"1. No formal information came from Tokyo
to the Kwantung Army about the progress of the JapaneseAmerican negotiations which were under way from summer
to autumn of 1941. However, I used to go up to Tokyo
on business, at which times I got fragmentary news
of them, which I reported to the commander-in-chief
and others on my return. Therefore, the Kwantung
Army knew of the tense situation of the negotiations
with the United States by news of this kind as well
as by information in the newspapers.

"2. Commander UMLZU was very much worried by receipt of such information, and used to express to us staff officers his personal opinion that Japan should not begin a war with the United States even

3

5

6

8

10

11

12

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

23 24

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2959 will receive exhibit No. 3699.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3699 and received in evidence.)

the formal parts.

"I served as an operations staff officer of the Kwantung Army from August 1940 to August 1943. I state here about the outbreak of the Pacific War and the relation of the Kwantung Army to it.

"1. No formal information came from Tokyo
to the Kwantung Army about the progress of the JapaneseAmerican negotiations which were under way from summer
to autumn of 1941. However, I used to go up to Tokyo
on business, at which times I got fragmentary news
of them, which I reported to the commander-in-chief
and others on my return. Therefore, the Kwantung
Army knew of the tense situation of the negotiations
with the United States by news of this kind as well
as by information in the newspapers.

"2. Commander UMLZU was very much worried by receipt of such information, and used to express to us staff officers his personal opinion that Japan should not begin a war with the United States even

3

5

7

8

9

11

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

22

23 24

under the worst conditions.

"3. When I went up to "okyo on business in November 1941, I happened to have a talk with Director of the Soldiers' Affairs Bureau TANAKA about current conditions. Then I told him that Commander UMEZU was of the opinion that Japan should not engage in war with the United States in any circumstances, which TANAKA well understood.

"4. The Kwantung Army received no intelligence reports concerning operations plans against the United States; much less were we consulted about those matters.

"We received a notice from Tokyo by telegram at the end of November, that Japan was making preparations for war with the United States. For the Kwantung Army no new duties were assigned, however; it was emphasized that the Kwantung Army should specially preserve tranquillity with the U.S.S.R.

8 December by public broadcast on that very morning; the formal order came after that.

"5. After the outbreak of the Pacific War, Commander UMEZU frequently stated to me that it was most unfortunate that Japan had begun war with the United States."

You may cross-examine.

5

7 8

9

10 11

12

14

13

15

17

18

19

21

22

23

TAKEI

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

## BY COLONEL IVANOV:

Q Mr. Witness, what was your rank in 1940 when you began to work in the Kwantung Army Headquarters?

- A Lieutenant-Colonel in the Army.
- Q And what was your rank in 1943 when you finished your work in the Kwantung Army Headquarters?
  - A Colonel.
- Q Mr. Witness, in item 4 of your affidavit you point out that the Kwantung Army in 1941 should preserve tranquillity with the U.S.S.R. Is that so?
  - A Yes.
- Q Did you attend in your capacity of Operations
  Staff Officer of the Kwantung Army on an equal footing
  with other responsible officers of the Kwantung Army
  Headquarters at the conferences of formation commanders
  during the speeches made by the Commanding General
  and the Chief of Staff of the Kwantung Army?
  - A Yes.
- Q Do you remember that such conferences were held in April and December 1941, and were you present at them?
  - A I remember them; I attended them.
- Q You, as well as other staff officers, were shown records of the speeches made by the Chief of

Staff, were you not?

A Yes, I was informed.

Q Did the Commanding General of the Kwantung

Army and his chief of staff address those conferences -
Commanding General of the Kwantung Army UMEZU?

A Commanding General UMEZU gave instructions and the Chief of Staff gave lectures.

Q And what was the basic idea of those addresses?
Was it also the preservation of tranquillity with the
U.S.S.R.?

A Commanding General UMEZU of the Kwantung

Army had the utmost concern with this matter and to

all the troops, units, armies and corps under his

command he gave the most rigid instructions that his

instructions be observed. The same similar instructions

were also issued by his Chief of Staff in the course

of his lectures.

COLONEL IVANOV: May the witness be shown prosecution's document 3200.

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

Q Will you tell us, Mr. Witness, whether from the document, the photo copy of which is being shown to you, is an indication that the document was in the possession of the Kwantung Army Headquarters?

A This constitutes a small part of the lectures given by Chief of Staff TOJO at that time.

THE MONITOR: Strike "TOJO."

ment constitutes -- the contents of this document constitutes but a small part of the lectures given by the Chief of Staff at that time. Although this is an authentic document, the most important portions are omitted. I can say that this document is almost valueless."

Q What is the date of the document?

A 5th of December 1941.

K p u 8 Y d

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

Is the document marked "Top Secret"?

Yes, I find the seal. A

Please read the title of this document.

"Gist of Lectures Given by the Chief of Staff Pefore a Conference of Army and Corps Commanders December, 1941."

COLONEL IVANOV: I offer in evidence prosecution document No. 3200, which is a photo copy of the original outline of the speech made by the Chief of Staff of the Kwantung Army at the conference of Formation Commanders in December, 1941, and relating to the matter of information service and the study of military position of the USSR in Mongolia. Two certificates are attached to the photo copy. One of them is a certificate of the Military Historical Department of the General Staff of the armed forces of the USSR. 16

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: I object to the reception of this document on the ground it is without the scope of the testimony in chief of this witness. It seems to be offered in an effort to show that the Kwantung Army did not attempt to preserve tranquility vis-a-vis the USSR, and counsel therefore is purporting to hang him cross-examination on the last sentence of the second paragraph of section 4 of the affidavit.

22

23 24

TAKEI

 I point out, however, that the sentence in question relates to the order from Tokyo that the Kwantung Armv preserve tranquility with the USSR. The witness has in no way offered to testify concerning what was done or was not done by the Kwantung Army, but has confined his testimony solely to the question of what information was supplied or what orders given from Tokyo.

which I am now offering has direct bearing upon the contention in the affidavit of the present witness that the Kwantung Army should specially preserve tranquility with the USSR, and the document which is being offered shows that the Kwantung Army was preparing for an attack against the USSR and was waiting for a favorable time and turning point in the situation.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is overruled and the document admitted.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3200 will receive exhibit No. 3700.

(Whereupon, in document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3700 and received in evidence.)

COLONEL IVANOV: "With the Tribunal's permission I shall read the document, exhibit 3700:

"OUTLINE OF THE SPEECH MADE BY THE CHIEF OF STAFF, KWANTUNG ARMY, AT THE CONFERENCE OF FORMATION CONTANDERS IN DECEMBER, 1941.

"Feadquarters of the Kwantung Army, 5 December 1941.

"IV. On the Information Service.

"1. Regarding Investigation of the Soviet-Mongolian Military Situation.

"Changes in the international situation are extremely rapid. Fspecially inconstant is the Soviet-Nongolian military situation in the Far Fast, which is changing hourly in accordance with developments in the Russo-German War situation and with the tense situation in the Pacific its true state is difficult to comprehend at present.

"However, in order to complete the uninterrupted preparation for operations against the USSR not only
the KWANTUNG army but also the front-line armies and
army groups must watch for changes in the ever-changing
Soviet-Mongolian military situation and exert their
utmost efforts so as to comprehend the actual situation
at the moment. This is more true in the present situation in which earlier discernment of indications of
change in the situation is more and more urgently required.

3

2

5

7 8

9

10

12

14

13

15 16

17

19

21 22

23

Oscip Reselenced organ or information be end Alrected to Attalk hore success in informat. The Covietation of the State of 12. Regarding Pirrieson and Morough Drengring Obergt fore stilling want lie was filled to be filled to be for the state of the filled to be for the state of t SESTIBLE OF STATE OF Int is an important matter indispensable for Dresent Cortet Mongolian Military Sthiation. TO OUR REFERENCE CORRECTIONS OF THE OF THE SERVER SERVERS SERV 9 10 Je Pore dissibility that before the Commence so his the 1, The profession of the Constant 1 A A HO NAME OF BUILDING AND STREET SOF BOARD AND STREET SOFT BOARD AND 3 THE THE HUMBER OF THE HAMBER OF BELLEVILLE TO THE OF THE COMPECT O 17 1 THE STANTONG AND SPECIAL MARKETS AND SPECIAL MARKETS. 少 15 thet the Soviet Burel Office of the Control of the Control of the State of the South of the State of the Stat 30 Anthererope, I des the espectally that stars to be berrectly understood by then. 仑 20 Clear Profit this do coment that as a little sing that the same and th 2 STREET A JULI CHILL GOOD WILL BE A STREET OF THE STREET ST 3 Drederation for at the city as the USSR and was made 3 2 THE POR & BURNING BOUNT IN THE WAR SHARE WAS AND A STATE OF THE WORLD BEEN AND A STATE OF THE ST The Contents Miles Mark to been read is in with in-19 eneral. 20 structions or order. 21 document, it Correction: 22 ne Kwantung Army gave appears that the Chief of 23 lectures of instructions to the ormation Commanders 24 of the army in accordance with orders from the Command-25 ing General.

"In this connection, I earnestly desire that each assigned organ of information be encouraged and directed to attain more success in information services.

"2. Regarding Diffusion and Thorough Understanding of the Soviet-Mongolian Military Situation.

reparing operations against the USCR to have each assigned army group and unit understand thoroughly the present coviet-Mongolian military situation. However, to our regret the carrying out of this task at present is more difficult than before the commencement of the Kwantung Army Special Maneuvers due to the considerable increase in the number of personnel for training and in the number of the specially formed units in connection with the KWANTUNG Army Special Maneuvers.

"Therefore, I desire especially that staff
officers and subordinates be encouraged and guided so
that the Soviet-Mongolien military situation may come
to be perfectly understood by them."

o Will you tell us, Mr. Witness, isn't it clear from this document that as a matter of fact the Kwantung Army took measures to provide for the speedy preparation for an attack against the USSR and was waiting for a turning point in the war in the West?

A The contents which has just been read is in

TAKEI

7 8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

connection with matters which were of interest only to those who were connected with the question of information and intelligence. The question of preserving tranquility vis-a-vis the Soviet Union, which was the all-important policy of the Kwantung Army, is an entirely separate matter.

Do you confirm that this speech made by the Chief of Staff of the Ywantung Army was made in the presence of Commanding General UMEZU, who approved of it?

It is a document approved by the Commanding General, UMEZU. It is shown on this document that it was approved by the Commanding General, UNEZU.

Were the demands set forth in the directives sent out by the Chief of Staff of the Kwantung Army to the Formation Commanders of the Kwantung Army?

The practice was for the Chief of Staff of the Kwantung Army to give lectures to all the Formation Commanders of the Kwantung Army in accordance with instructions or orders from the Commanding General.

Correction: According to this document, it appears that the Chief of Staff of the Kwantung Army gave lectures of instructions to the Formation Commanders of the army in accordance with orders from the Commanding General.

Q Didn't the Commanding General of the Kwantung Army, UMFZU, direct the measures known under the name of Kantokuen, which is mentioned twice in this document?

A There is no mistaking the fact that General UNEZU supervised the matter in accordance with the orders from the Central Army Authorities.

o "asn't the basic purpose of Kentokuen speedy military preparation in expectation of the turning point in the Russo-German war?

A No, that is entirely wrong.

COLONEL IVANOV: May the witness be shown prosecution document No. 3201?

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

o Tell us, Mr. Witness, does this document, the photo copy of which is being shown to you, also belong to the Kwantung Army Headquarters and relate to 1941?

A I recall that the gist of a part of the lectures was given by the Chief of Staff of the Kwantung army at a conference of Formation Commanders on the 26th of April, 1941, as given here.

o Is the document marked "Secret"?

A It says "Military Top Secret."

19 20

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

21

22 23

24

10

11

12

13 14

15

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

16 17

COLONEL IVANOV: I offer in evidence prosecution document No. 3201, which is a photo copy of the original outline of the speech made by the Chief of taff of the Kwantung Army at the conference of Formation Commanders in April, 1941, concerning the estimate of the situation in regard to the Soviet and the Japanese-Soviet neutrality pact.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3201 will receive exhibit No. 3701.

(Thereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3701 and received in evidence.)

36,908

colonel IVANOV: With the Tribunal's permission I shall read an excerpt from this document, beginning with the second paragraph:

"The Soviet Union, considering this present European War as a good opportunity with which to realize her world policy, is secretly planning to prolong this war and to extend it territorially. On the surface, the Soviet Union is strictly maintaining an attitude of neutrality and progressing towards the strengthening of her own power. On the other hand, she is facing this war with a policy of gradually expanding her sphere of influence without being thrown into the vortex of war. However, the sensational war results of the German Army since the outbreak of the war and its concentration of superior military forces in the East not only gradually deepened the apprehension of the Soviet Union but as was expected the recent execution by force of Germany's Balkan policy inflicted a great menace to the Soviet Union's policy towards Southeastern Europe.

"Relations between Germany and the Soviet
Union has not necessarily continued to be favorable
as it was in the beginning. Germany's maintenance of
a powerful force against Soviet Union is a great
threat to her; she is openly expressing her opposition

2

5

7

9

8

10

12 13

14

15

17

18 19

20

21

24

5

6

7 8

11 12

10

14

15

13

16 17

18 19

20

21 22

23 24

25

to Germany's Balkan policy, and being in great fear of Germany making a rear attack, she is intently strengthening her preparations for war against Germany in her western front.

"Just at this time, on April 13, the Russo-Japanese Neutrality Pact was concluded in Moscow. Although its content is as was already announced, I shall take this opportunity to try to express my opinions concerning this pact.

In accordance with the present situa-"1. tion of the Empire, it is a diplomatic measure planned to maintain for the time being, peace between Japan and the Soviet Union for the purpose of strengthening the Tri-Partite Alliance. Whether or not this pact can be made effective depends upon the future attitude of the two countries. It cannot be considered that we can immediately enter into friendly relations with the present attitudes. Consequently, in order to make this pact effective, our Army absolutely cannot permit the slacking down in its preparations for military operations. By steadily strengthening and expanding these preparations, the effectiveness of the pact will be promoted. The Army will not make any changes in its past policies. However, useless speeches and actions of soldiers and officers which

would negate the effectiveness of this pact should be checked absolutely and at the same time it is of vital importance that proper Army duties be carried out silently to the utmost degree adhering to the above views.

"2. The mental attitude of the Army in connection with the conclusion of this neutrality pact is as stated previously. However, since there is a fear that the past tension which existed between Japan and Manchukuo on the one hand and Russia and Mongolia on the other would suddenly be relieved based on the misunderstanding of this pact by the officials and people of Manchukuo, in guiding them, there is a 14 necessity to leave no room for regret.

15 "3. There are people in both Japan and Manchukuo who often say that military preparations against Soviet Russia may be reduced since the neutrality pact was concluded. However, as mentioned previously, there must not only be no changes in our past policy of military preparations against Soviet Russia, but since the necessity for us to take a precise and lofty attitude towards ideology, counterespionage, and other forms of strategm is especially great, it is necessary for us to have our subordinates thoroughly understand this purport promptly.

10 . 11

12

13

16

17 18

19

20

22

23

"Moreover, in regards to having our subordia nates thoroughly understand this, it is especially necessary to carry it out in strict secrecy and carefulness in order to prevent the nullification of the political effect of this pact. Although the general trend of the Soviet Union and the opinions concerning the conclusion of the Neutrality Pact are as stated above, the accumulation of the Soviet Union's military power in the next few years will exert a grave influence on both Japan and Manchukuo. Therefore, on the one hand, we must steadily strengthen and expand our preparations for war against the Soviet Union, and on the other hand, we must promote friendly relations with Russia. Together with striving for the realization of armed peace, we must make preparations for certain victory in military operations against the Soviet Union in case of emergency."

Q Mr. Witness, will you tell us whether this speech was also made in the presence of the Commanding General UMEZU and whether it was approved by him, this speech made by the Kwantung Army Chief of Staff?

A I have no recollection now whether or not General UMEZU was present.

Q But as a staff officer of the Kwantung Army you, Mr. "itness, should know whether the Chief of

10

8

9

11

13 14

15

16 17

18

20

21

23

Staff could make a responsible address to the Formation Commanders and give them instructions without the previous approval of the Commanding General of the Kwantung Army?

A Whenever the Chief of Staff made any lecture it naturally required the approval of the Commanding General; but whenever the Chief of Staff made any lectures at any meeting, the Commanding General of the Kwantung Army was not necessarily present.

COLONEL IVANOV: May the witness be again shown exhibit 3701?

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

Q Mr. Witness, will you please read the inscription on the back of the first page written in Japanese by the full General KAWABE?

A IPS document No. 3201, handed to me by the International Prosecution Section, is an accurate photostat of an outline of addresses made, by the Chief of Staff of the Kyantung Army before Kwantung Army Formation Commanders. This conference was held on the 26 April 1941 under the auspices of the Commanding General of the Kwantung Army, General UMEZU, at which a lecture was given by the Chief of Staff of the Kwantung Army. I was present at the lecture.

. 8

After the conclusion of the conference I was handed a document of which this is a photostatic copy at the conference. I identify this as being an authentic document.

THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until halfpast nine tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment was taken until Thursday, 8 January 1948, at 0930.)